



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,736	07/28/2003	Akinori Sancto	06753.0556	3804

7590 02/27/2004

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

ESTRADA, ANGEL R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2831

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/627,736

Applicant(s)

SANETO ET AL.

Examiner

Angel R. Estrada

Art Unit

2831

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc. (*line 1, "comprises"*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102^e(~~a~~) as being anticipated by ^{AR 2/6/04} Depp et al (hereinafter Depp).

Regarding claim 1, Depp discloses an electrical junction box (10) comprising: a junction box body (14); and a cover (12) which houses and holds the junction box body (14), wherein a guide rail groove (38) is provided on any one of an inner surface of the cover (12) and an outer surface of the junction box body, and a guide rail (40) guided by the guide rail groove (38) is provided on the other (14) thereof; and the guide rail groove (38) is formed so that the inlet side thereof is a wide groove part (60) having a width wider than that of the guide rail (see figure 1 and 16)

Regarding claim 4, Depp discloses the electrical junction box (10), the wide groove part (60) is a groove having a straight-line shape, which gradually expands toward the inlet thereof (see figure 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Depp et al (hereinafter Depp).

Regarding claim 2, Depp discloses the claimed invention except for the wide groove part being a curved groove part having a circular arc shape. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to change the shape of the wide groove part from a straight line shape to a circular arc shape, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component. Where the instant specification and evidence of record fail to attribute any significance (novel or unexpected results) to

a particular shape, a change of shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *Span-Deck Inc. V. FabCon, Inc.*, 215 USPQ 835.

Regarding claim 3, the modified Depp discloses the electrical junction box (10), wherein the guide rail groove (38) includes a straight groove part (62) which holds the guide rail (40), and the curved groove part (as modified in claim 2).

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Depp et al (hereinafter Depp) in view of Hayakawa et al (US 5,915,978, hereinafter Hayakawa).

Regarding claim 5, Depp discloses the claimed invention except for a locking groove being provided on an inner side of the guide rail groove and a lock projection engaged with the locking groove being provided on the side of the guide rail to allow the cover to hold the junction box body. Hayakawa discloses an electrical junction box (see figures 1-3) having a junction box body (30) and a cover (see figure 4) which houses and holds the junction box body (30), the junction box body (30) has a locking groove (see figure 4) on the inner side of a guide rail groove (34) and the cover (see figure 4) has a guide rail (35) with a lock projection (36) that engages the locking groove to allow the cover to hold the junction box body. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make Depp's junction box body with guide rail groove having a locking groove on an inner surface that engages a lock projection in guide rail as taught by Hayakawa to provide means to firmly secure the junction box body to the cover.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chiriku et al (US 6,515,226 and US 6,541,700), Matsuoka (US 6,121,548), Depp et al (US 6,561,822 and US 6,679,708), Ito (US 5,702,021), Oda (US 5,515,988) disclose an electrical junction box having a junction box body with guide rail groove and a cover with guide rail, or vice versa.


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Angel R. Estrada at telephone number (571) 272-1973. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 -5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on (571) 272-1984. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

AE

February 4, 2004


DEAN A. REICHARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800